

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TESSY EVON GARRETT-BABERS,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY,  
Defendant.

Case No. 1:25-cv-00686-CDB (SS)

ORDER GRANTING APPLICATION TO  
PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS* AND  
DIRECTING CLERK OF THE COURT TO  
ISSUE SUMMONS, SCHEDULING ORDER,  
AND CONSENT OR REQUEST FOR  
REASSIGNMENT DOCUMENTS

(Doc. 2)

Plaintiff Tessy Evon Garrett-Babers (“Plaintiff”) initiated this action with the filing of a complaint on June 5, 2025, seeking review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying disability insurance and benefits. (Doc. 1). Plaintiff did not pay the filing fee and instead filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (or “IFP”) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. (Doc. 2). For the following reasons, the Court finds issuance of the new case documents and Plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* appropriate.

**I. Proceeding *In Forma Pauperis***

The Court may authorize the commencement of an action without prepayment of fees “by a person who submits an affidavit that includes a statement of all assets such [person] possesses [and] that the person is unable to pay such fees or give security therefor.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). Here, the Court has reviewed Plaintiff’s application and financial status affidavit (Doc. 2) and finds

1 the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) are satisfied.

2 **II. Screening Requirement**

3 When a party seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the Court is required to review the  
 4 complaint and shall dismiss the complaint, or portion thereof, if it is “frivolous, malicious or fails  
 5 to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or … seeks monetary relief from a defendant  
 6 who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(b) & (e)(2). A plaintiff’s claim is frivolous  
 7 “when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible, whether or not  
 8 there are judicially noticeable facts available to contradict them.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S.  
 9 25, 32-33 (1992).

10 **III. Pleading Standards**

11 A complaint must include a statement affirming the court’s jurisdiction, “a short and plain  
 12 statement of the claim showing the pleader is entitled to relief; and a demand for the relief sought,  
 13 which may include relief in the alternative or different types of relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The  
 14 purpose of the complaint is to give the defendant fair notice of the claims, and the grounds upon  
 15 which the complaint stands. *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 512 (2002). As set forth  
 16 by the Supreme Court, Rule 8:

17 ... does not require detailed factual allegations, but it demands more than an  
 18 unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation. A pleading that offers  
 19 labels and conclusions or a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action  
 further factual enhancement.

20 *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).  
 21 Vague and conclusory allegations do not support a cause of action. *Ivey v. Board of Regents*, 673  
 22 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982). The *Iqbal* Court clarified further,

23 [A] complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to “state a  
 24 claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S.  
 25 544, 570 (2009). A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual  
 26 content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is  
 liable for the misconduct alleged. *Id.* at 556. The plausibility standard is not akin  
 27 to a “probability requirement,” but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a  
 defendant has acted unlawfully. *Id.* Where a complaint pleads facts that are “merely  
 consistent with” a defendant’s liability, it “stops short of the line between possibility  
 and plausibility of “entitlement to relief.”

28 *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678. When factual allegations are well-pled, a court should assume their truth

1 and determine whether the facts would make the plaintiff entitled to relief; legal conclusions are  
2 not entitled to the same assumption of truth. (*Id.*). The Court may grant leave to amend a complaint  
3 to the extent deficiencies of the complaint can be cured by an amendment. *Lopez v. Smith*, 203  
4 F.3d 1122, 1127-28 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc).

5 **IV. Discussion and Analysis**

6 Plaintiff seeks review of a decision by the Commissioner of Social Security denying  
7 disability benefits. (Doc. 1). The Court may have jurisdiction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g),  
8 which provides:

9 Any individual after any final decision of the Commissioner made after a hearing to  
10 which he was a party, irrespective of the amount in controversy, may obtain a review  
11 of such decision by a civil action commenced within sixty days after the mailing to  
12 him of such decision or within such further time as the Commissioner may allow.  
13 Such action shall be brought in the district court of the United States for the judicial  
district in which the plaintiff resides or has his principal place of business...The  
court shall have power to enter, upon the pleadings and transcript of the record, a  
judgment affirming, modifying, or reversing the decision of the Commissioner of  
Social Security, with or without remanding the cause for a rehearing.

14 (*Id.*). Except as provided by statute, “[n]o findings of fact or decision of the Commissioner shall  
15 be reviewed by any person, tribunal, or governmental agency.” 42 U.S.C. § 405(h).

16 On April 3, 2025, the Appeals Council denied Plaintiff’s request for review of the decision  
17 of the Administrative Law Judge denying Plaintiff’s claim for benefits and income. (Doc. 1, ¶ 2).  
18 As such, Plaintiff has 60 days from April 3, 2025, to file a civil action, notwithstanding any  
19 additional time due to mail service. (*Id.*) (“60 days, plus five (5) days for delivery by mail, to file  
20 a Civil Action.”); 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); 20 C.F.R. § 404.981. On June 5, 2025, Plaintiff filed a  
21 complaint in this Court seeking judicial review of the Commissioner’s final decision. (*See id.*).  
22 Thus, Plaintiff’s complaint is timely. Plaintiff claims residency in Kern County, California. (Doc.  
23 1, ¶ 4). Therefore, the Court has jurisdiction over this action.

24       ///

25       ///

26       ///

27       ///

28       ///

1      **V. Conclusion and Order**

2      Plaintiff's complaint states a cognizable claim for review of the administrative decision  
3      denying Social Security benefits and supplemental income. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY  
4      ORDERED that Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 2) is GRANTED. The  
5      Clerk of Court is directed to issue the following: 1) a Summons; 2) the Scheduling Order; 3) the  
6      Order re Consent or Request for Reassignment; and 4) a Consent to Assignment or Request for  
7      Reassignment form.

8      IT IS SO ORDERED.

9      Dated: June 6, 2025

  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28